## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

GREGORY L. HUGHES, :

Plaintiff

v. : CIVIL NO. 3:CV-00-17

JOSEPH W. CHESNEY, <u>ET AL.</u>, : (Judge Kosik)

Defendants :

## ORDER

## \_\_\_NOW, THIS 2nd DAY OF AUGUST, 2005, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED AS FOLLOWS:

- 1. Within ten (10) days from the date of this Order, plaintiff shall file his brief, statement of material facts, and evidentiary materials in opposition to Defendant O'Connor's summary judgment motion. The failure to do so will result in the motion being deemed unopposed and addressed on the merits by the court. No further motions for enlargement of time will be entertained with regard to this motion.<sup>1</sup>
- 2. Within fifteen (15) days from the date of this Order, plaintiff shall file his response to the motion to dismiss filed by the Corrections Defendants on May 27, 2005 in accordance with Fed.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Plaintiff has been granted several motions for enlargement of time with regard to filing his opposition to Defendant O'Connor's motion which was filed on February 3, 2005. The latest enlargement directed plaintiff to file his opposition on or before July 29, 2005. No submissions were made by plaintiff. The resolution of this case has been lingering due to plaintiff's failure to file his opposing documents. If such documents are not submitted within ten (10) days, the motion will be deemed unopposed and considered.

Case 3:00-cv-00017-EMK-LQ	Document 190	Filed 08/02/05	Page 2 of 2

R. Civ. P. 12 and M.D. Pa. Local Rule 7.6. The failure to do so will result in the dismissal of plaintiff's claims with regard to these defendants pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b). <u>See Stackhouse v. Mazurkiewicz</u>, 951 F.2d 29 (3d Cir. 1991).<sup>2</sup>

s/Edwin M. Kosik
United States District Judge

EMK:lq

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> The court is cognizant of the special difficulties facing <u>pro se</u> litigants. <u>See Haines v. Kerner</u>, 404 U.S. 519 (1972). However, the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit has emphasized that local rules play "a vital role in the district courts' efforts to manage themselves and their dockets." <u>Eash v. Riggins Trucking, Inc.</u>, 757 F.2d 557, 570 (3d Cir. 1985). Therefore, the court will afford plaintiff an opportunity to respond to the defendants' motion to dismiss in accordance with Fed. R. Civ. P. 12 and M.D. Pa. Local Rule 7.6, or his claims will be dismissed pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).